

Remarks

Claims 1-13 were pending. Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 2 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, *inter alia*, at page 5, line 30 – page 6, line 15 and Fig. 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and passage of the claims to allowance.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as being anticipated by Murayama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,764,342). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. in view of Akama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,439,928). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the features of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Murayama. In particular, Murayama does not disclose the structure of the claimed invention, namely “...the housing being provided with at least one slot disposed at a location between two pairs of contacts, the at least one slot being open at a perimeter side of the fully-assembled housing...” As discussed in the specification, the shielding plates and/or grounding rail can be inserted into the module at any time, including after assembly (see page 6, lines 3 et seq. – “Rather, the telecommunications module can be completed during the production thereof, and the shield plates and grounding rail can be added thereafter.”) As such, one can insert or remove shielding and/or the grounding rail for different telecommunications applications. (see page 6, lines 10-15)

In contrast, Murayama discloses a cable connector 100, where shielding plates 90 are pre-installed (see Fig. 4). The plate accommodation slits 21 and the separator accommodation slits 22 are not arranged on a perimeter side of the fully-assembled housing as is claimed, but are instead provided in an interior portion of the connector 100 (as shown in the exploded view of

Fig. 4). As such, with the device of Murayama, one cannot insert or remove shielding and/or the grounding rail for different telecommunications applications.

As Murayama does not disclose each element of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Murayama. Regarding claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that Murayama does not teach or suggest the features of claim 11 for at least the reasons above. Regarding claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that Akama fails to teach or suggest the claimed structure of claim 1 and thus does not overcome the deficiencies of the Murayama reference.

Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice, rendering that rejection moot.

In summary, for at least the reasons stated above, the rejection of claims 1-13 as being unpatentable over the cited art has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Please contact the undersigned should there be any questions or in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

September 18, 2008
Date

By: /Gregg H. Rosenblatt/
Gregg H. Rosenblatt, Reg. No.: 45,056
Telephone No.: (512) 984-7443

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833